UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,368	01/14/2004	Secondo Dottori	247518US0CONT	2368
22850 7590 09/25/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			SAUCIER, SANDRA E	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
		·	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		09/25/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/756,368	DOTTORI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Sandra Saucier	1651			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION (186(a). In no event, however, may a mill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Ju	<u>ine 2007</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 57-61 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 57-61 is/are rejected. 					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11).	epted or b) objected to liderated or b) objected to liderating(s) be held in abeyand on is required if the drawing(nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in A ity documents have been i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s 5) Notice of Ir	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	<u></u> .			

Application/Control Number: 10/756,368

Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 57-61 are pending and are considered on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 57-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweeney *et al.* [AW] in combination with US 5,747,536 [AA] and Ogawa *et al.*[U] and Tegos *et al.*[V].

The claims are directed to a method comprising: adding L-carnitine or an ester of carnitine to a platelet concentrate which has been leukodepleted and suspending the platelet concentrate in the mixture.

The intent of the claimed methods is the suppression of bacterial growth in the platelet concentrate.

Sweeney et al. disclose a method of adding L-carnitine or acetyl-carnitine (5mM) to platelet concentrates and agitating the mixture. This is said to reduce glycolysis in the platelet mixture.

Tegos *et al.* teach that glycolytic enzymes are present in isolated platelets.

Ogawa et al. teach the advantages of leukodepleting platelet products with regard to prevention of adverse reactions to PC transfusion.

US 5,747,536 discloses that esters of carnitine other than acetyl ester are known.

The primary reference lacks the disclosure of leukodepleting the platelet concentrate and use of the homologous derivatives of acetylcarnitine.

The substitution of other esters of carnitine such as butyryl, valeryl, propionyl, isobutyryl for the acetyl ester of carnitine in the method of Sweeney et al. would have been obvious when US 5,747,536 was taken with Sweeney et al. because US 5,747,536 lists various esters of carnitine and also further discloses the addition of carnitine or its derivatives to platelet concentrates. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the salts and esters of L-carnitine would reasonably be expected to have a similar activity to L-carnitine or acetylcarnitine because these are simple homologs which may be reasonably expected to have similar properties and activities in the

Application/Control Number: 10/756,368

Art Unit: 1651

absence of evidence to the contrary.

The substitution of a leukodepleted platelet concentrate for the platelet concentrate of the primary reference would have been obvious because both a nonleukodepleted platelet concentrate and a leukodepleted platelet concentrate comprise platelets, and platelets possess the glycolytic enzymes, see Tegos et al. which result in glycolysis during storage. Therefore, even if the leukocytes are removed for advantages known in the art, see Ogawa et al., glycolysis in the preparation would still be expected to occur. Thus, the addition of L-carnitine, salts or esters thereof, to a leukodepleted platelet concentrate would be expected to reduce the glycolysis in the platelets and to maintain platelet quality as taught by Sweeney et al.

Although the applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestions of the prior art, this fact cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Although the intent of applicant's method is different from the intent of the disclosed method, the one step of adding carnitine or an ester of carnitine in the same concentration is the same. Thus, the results of the method, suppression of bacterial growth, would reasonably be assumed to be the same as the result claimed.

It is not relevant to the analysis of the claimed method that the reference makes no mention of suppressing bacterial growth. Discovery of a new benefit for an old process does not render the old process patentable. *In re* Woodruff, 919 F. 2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Merely because the reference did not have one of applicant's purposes in mind when the (drug was administered) does not alter the drug's physiological activity. In the context of an anticipation rejection, the Federal Circuit stated, "Where, as here, the result is a necessary consequence of what was deliberately intended, it is of no import that the article's authors did not appreciate the results." Mehl/Biophile Int'l Corp. v. Milgraum, 192 F. 3d 1362, 1366, 52 USPQ2d 1303, 1307 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

See also In re Cruciferous Sprout 64 USPQ2d 1202 Fed. Circuit.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated at the time

Application/Control Number: 10/756,368

Art Unit: 1651

of invention to make these substitutions in order to obtain the results as suggested by the references with a reasonable expectation of success. The claimed subject matter fails to patentably distinguish over the state of the art as represented by the cited references. Therefore, the claims are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Conclusion

To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1651. The supervisor for 1651 is M. Wityshyn, (703) 308-4743. The normal work schedule for Examiner Saucier is Monday through Friday.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Saucier whose telephone number is (571) 272-0922. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, M. Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sandra Saucier Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651